

combat operations in the Al Anbar province of Iraq, on June 26. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA. He was from Riverside, CA.

Pfc Rex A. Page, 21, died June 28 from wounds received while conducting combat operations in the Al Anbar province of Iraq. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Spc Christopher D. Rose, 21, died on June 29 of injuries sustained from an improvised explosive device during combat operations in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 67th Armored Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, TX. He was from San Francisco, CA.

Cpl Ryan J. Clark, 19, died on June 29 at Brooke Army Medical Center, San Antonio, TX. He died of injuries sustained on June 17, in Ar Ramadi, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device detonated near his military vehicle. He was assigned to C Company, 40th Engineer Battalion, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany. He was from Lancaster, CA.

Sgt Thomas B. Turner, Jr., 31, died on July 14 at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Landstuhl, Germany. He died of injuries sustained on July 13, in Muqadiyah, Iraq, when multiple improvised explosive devices detonated near his military vehicle. He was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 32nd Cavalry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, Kentucky. He was from Cottonwood, CA.

Sgt Andres J. Contreras, 23, died on July 15 of injuries sustained when his vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device in Baghdad, Iraq during combat operations. He was assigned to the 519th Military Police Battalion, 1st Combat Support Brigade, Fort Polk, LA. He was from Huntington Park, CA.

SSgt Jason M. Evey, 29, died on July 16 of injuries sustained when his Bradley Fighting Vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device during combat operations in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, Fort Hood, TX. He was from Stockton, CA.

Spc Manuel J. Holguin, 21, died on July 15 in Baghdad, Iraq, of injuries sustained when his dismounted patrol encountered an improvised explosive device and small arms fire. He was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2nd Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany. He was from Woodlake, CA.

I also pay tribute to the three soldiers from or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since April 6.

Spc Justin L. O'Donohoe, 27, died east of Abad, Afghanistan, in the Kunar province, on May 5, when his

CH-47 Chinook helicopter crashed during combat operations. He was assigned to the 71st Cavalry Regiment, 10th Mountain Division, Light Infantry, Fort Drum, NY. He was from San Diego, CA.

Sgt Bryan A. Brewster, 24, died east of Abad, Afghanistan, in the Kunar province, on May 5 when his CH-47 Chinook helicopter crashed during combat operations. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 10th Aviation Regiment, 10th Mountain Division, Light Infantry, Fort Drum, NY. He was from Fontana, CA.

Cpl Bernard P. Corpuz, 28, died in Ghanzi, Afghanistan, on June 11 from wounds sustained when his convoy came under enemy small arms fire and an improvised explosive device detonated during combat operations. He was assigned to the 303rd Military Intelligence Battalion, 504th Military Intelligence Brigade, Fort Hood, TX. He was from Watsonville, CA.

#### PRESIDENTIAL ENVOY FOR SUDAN REMARKS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a critical issue that I have addressed in this Chamber numerous times in the last several years, and that is the situation in Darfur. It is truly a shame that in July of 2006, the horrendous conditions and continued violence look very similar to that which first caught our attention in 2003.

Despite the recent peace agreement that was reached in early May between the Government of National Unity and one faction of the largest rebel group, the violence on the ground has continued unabated. This has led to a tenuous humanitarian situation.

According to the United Nations Children's Fund Darfur Nutrition Update for June 2006, malnutrition rates and admissions to therapeutic feeding centers are rising across Darfur. Under difficult conditions, our Government has done a tremendous job in providing assistance to the people of Darfur, including contributing over 80 percent of the food delivered in Darfur by the World Food Program. Unfortunately, our Government's efforts are not enough. Other donors must increase their contributions and fulfill the pledges they made.

To make these matters worse, the Government of Sudan blatantly refuses a U.N. peacekeeping mission in Darfur, leaving the African Union to try and enforce peace, which it has been unable to do thus far.

For these reasons, I am encouraging President Bush to appoint a Presidential envoy for Sudan as soon as possible. The fiscal year 2006 emergency supplemental includes a provision offered by Senator BIDEN and myself to create a Presidential special envoy and an office in the State Department to support it. This envoy is charged with working to resolve the conflict in Darfur, facilitating implementation of

the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the north and south Sudan, and resolving other internal and regional conflicts.

The timing of this appointment could not be more critical. Deputy Secretary of State Bob Zoellick is departing and other key administration officials that have been working on Sudan are rotating to new positions. I want to personally thank Secretary Zoellick for his commitment to peace in Sudan. His tireless efforts were at the forefront of this administration's clear commitment to this troubled country.

I urge the President to appoint a trusted leader who is committed to bringing about peace in Sudan once and for all.

The thought of making similar statements about Darfur in 2009 is unacceptable.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, during yesterday's debate on the Water Resources Development Act, Senator SARBANES, Senator JEFFORDS, and I agreed to submit for the RECORD a colloquy clarifying the intent of a provision authorizing the Poplar Island expansion project in Maryland. Unfortunately, this colloquy was inadvertently left out. I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point and that the permanent RECORD be corrected so that this colloquy appears with the rest of yesterday's debate on the bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman in a colloquy with respect to the provisions in section 1001(a)(20), authorizing the Poplar Island Expansion, Maryland.

Mr. INHOFE. I would be happy to respond to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I would simply like to clarify that it is the intent of the committee that this provision authorizes construction of a 575-acre addition to the existing 1,140-acre Poplar Island, MD, beneficial use of dredged material project which is presently under construction and authorizes an additional \$256.1 million for that expansion.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator from Maryland is correct. Section 1001(a)(20) authorizes the Secretary to construct the expansion of the Poplar Island, MD, project in accordance with the Report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 2006, at an additional total cost of \$256,100,000. This will increase the overall environmental restoration project at Poplar Island from 1,140 acres to approximately 1,715 acres and bring the total cost of the existing project and the expansion project to \$643.4 million, with an estimated Federal cost of \$482.4 million and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$161 million.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I concur that this is the committee's intent.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman and ranking member for this clarification and for including this provision which is vitally important for the Port of Baltimore and the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I thank you for having this important debate

regarding our Nation's aging infrastructure and for allowing this body to discuss the merits of Corps of Engineers reform.

As you know, I supported allowing this bill to come to the Senate floor for consideration. Congress has not passed a water resources authorization bill since 2000, and particularly in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, this debate is long overdue. While many attempted to derail consideration of this debate, I did not because I believed that we must have this discussion in the open.

That being said, I have deep concerns regarding the legislation that is before us today. Specifically, I am concerned that we are missing a historic opportunity to incorporate the many lessons learned since the last WRDA bill passed in 2000. Consider the following developments that highlight the critical need for reform of the Corps of Engineers:

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported in March 2006 that "the cost benefit analyses performed by the Corps to support decisions on Civil Works projects . . . were generally inadequate to provide a reasonable basis for deciding whether to proceed with the project . . ." GAO-06-529T—Corps of Engineers: Observations on Planning and Project Management Processes for the Civil Works Program (March 15, 2006)

In remarking on the fact that the Corps reprogrammed over \$2.1 billion through 7,000 reprogramming actions in fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the GAO noted that the Corps' practice was often "not necessary" and is "reflect[ive] of poor planning and an absence of Corps-wide priorities for its Civil Works priorities." GAO-06-529T—Corps of Engineers: Observations on Planning and Project Management Processes for the Civil Works Program (March 15, 2006)

In a report to Congress in 2003 regarding the Sacramento flood protection project, the GAO found that the Corps used "an inappropriate methodology to calculate the value of protected properties" and failed to properly report expected cost increases. Consider the projected costs for the three primary Sacramento projects: the Common Features Project increased from \$57 million in 1996 to \$370 million in 2002; the American Features project increased from \$44 million in 1996 to \$143 million in 2002; and the Natomis Basin component has ballooned from an early estimated cost of \$13 million, to \$212 million in 2002. GAO-04-30—Corps of Engineers: Improved Analysis of Costs & Benefits Needed for the Sacramento Flood Control Project.

Thanks to a Corps whistleblower and a subsequent investigation by the Army inspector general, we know that the Corps: "manipulated the economic analyses of the feasibility study being conducted on the Upper Mississippi lock expansion project in order to steer the study to a specific outcome." Furthermore, the investigation revealed that a Corps official knowingly directed that "mathematically flawed" data be used to justify the project. High-ranking Corps officials also were criticized for giving "preferential treatment to the barge industry . . ." by allowing industry representatives to become direct participants in the economic analysis." U.S. Office of Special Counsel: Statement of Elaine Kaplan. Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel (December 2000).

I could add several more examples, including the many lessons we have learned in the wake of Katrina, but my

point is clear: the processes used for project justification, for long-term planning, for cost containment, and for project accountability are fundamentally flawed and do not serve the best interests of American taxpayers. For too long, we have allowed project costs to soar, routinely accepted inaccurate studies to justify large projects, and rarely, if ever, asked the tough questions of Corps officials.

Congress plays a central role in the oversight of all Federal agencies, and with respect to the Corps, we have failed taxpayers miserably. Why? Perhaps a better question would be to ask who benefits most from lax congressional oversight. I would argue that Members themselves are the real winners. We get the projects we want, regardless of the cost or the overall impact on critical national infrastructure, and the Corps is allowed to operate as it pleases. This environment—with every incentive for construction and little or no incentive for accountability—is a recipe for disasters of all sorts.

The only way to fix this problem in the long term is to bring fiscal transparency and oversight to this process.

First and foremost, we have to develop our ability to prioritize authorized Corps projects. The Corps currently faces a \$58 billion dollar project backlog that will take many decades to resolve, and this bill will add over \$10 billion more to that backlog. Many worthwhile projects, already debated and authorized by previous Congresses, languish in the annual competition for appropriations. Taking their place in line are politically popular projects that rarely address vital national infrastructure needs. Again, we are failing taxpayers.

I am pleased to see the amendment offered by my colleagues, Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN, that will squarely address this lack of prioritization. The tools that will be provided by this amendment will strengthen the ability of Members of Congress to analyze the hundreds of authorized Corps projects and determine which are in the best interests of our Nation. Congress maintains its discretion to fund whichever projects it deems most appropriate, but we will do so with an abundance of new data that will highlight critical national infrastructural needs. Funds are increasingly limited, and we have a responsibility to prioritize projects based on their impact.

Second, in our efforts to improve this important process, Congress must consider ways to bring greater oversight to the Corps. The many instances of wrongdoing in the Corps project justification process make clear that we must do better. With billions of dollars at stake and often thousands of lives hanging in the balance, we simply cannot allow for manipulation and undue influence in the justification study process.

Again, I am pleased to see the efforts of Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD in

addressing this void. The Corps has proven itself incapable of mending these problems on its own, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the project justification process. It is imperative that outside experts, with no stake in large-scale construction proposals, be allowed to review these types of Corps studies. While I may have designed the amendment in a slightly different manner, I look forward to supporting the MCCAIN-FEINGOLD approach that will allow for a truly independent and time-sensitive review by a panel of experts. At the end of the day, Congress still makes the final decision on which projects to fund, and in no way will this amendment impact our constitutional obligations or slow project construction. We can still fund wasteful and inefficient spending if we so desire. If we pass this amendment, at least we will ensure that the studies we cite are accurate. We owe that to the American public.

I am grateful to my colleagues for the countless hours they have spent in putting this bill together. I know the road that led to this debate today was not an easy one, and it has been a long and difficult journey. As we embark on this debate and in our legitimate desire to pass this legislation, however, we must not overlook the critical need for Corps reform. The many lessons we have learned since WRDA 2000 are as numerous as they are pressing. The Corps of Engineers is staffed by many dedicated and hard-working Americans, many of whom are in my State. The agency itself, however, is ailing and demands our attention. If the Corps is to continue to meet the mandate it has been given and serve the needs of the American taxpayer, we must not move forward without the incorporation of new oversight and transparency.

America's waterways and flood control projects have played an important role in protecting our communities and in spurring agricultural and industrial commerce. Unless we can reform the Corps, though, their impact will increasingly diminish. As it stands today, the Corps is not accountable to Congress, and ultimately, it is not accountable to the American taxpayer. We have a historic opportunity to change this environment, and we must seize it.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of amendment No. 4684, the McCain-Feingold-Prioritization amendment, to the Water Resources Development Act.

The city of New Orleans has been under a constant threat of flooding from the "big one" ever since it was founded in 1718. Though the city has survived, its flood control defenses have been tested and occasionally overwhelmed. There was the great flood of 1927 when the Mississippi River spilled into the city, and there was Hurricane Betsy in 1965, which, according to Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, "picked up ... [Lake Pontchartrain]

and put it inside New Orleans and Jefferson Parish.”

In the same year that Betsy inundated the city, Congress authorized a hurricane protection project to protect the city. That project was supposed to take 13 years, cost \$85 million, and, according to the Army Corps, protect greater New Orleans from the equivalent of a fast-moving category 3 hurricane.

In the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee's investigation into the preparation for and response to Hurricane Katrina, our committee learned that that project was still a decade or more away from completion—close to 50 years after this body authorized its construction—and the total cost of the project had ballooned to more than \$750 million. In addition, the project did not provide the level of protection for New Orleans and the region that it was expected to provide.

There were many reasons for the delay, including natural ones such as the subsidence of the land in southeastern Louisiana. Building levees in this part of the country required the Army Corps to return time and time again to add additional layers to the levees, known as lifts, to accommodate for the sinking soils.

But there were also manmade reasons for the delay, such as the absence of Federal funding. In recent years, local Army Corps officials have had to scramble to move these Louisiana hurricane protection projects forward. Local Army Corps officials had to urge local levee boards to contact their congressional delegation to ask for financial help to restore levees to their original design height, and on two recent occasions, the Army Corps had to rely on the local levee districts, which share in the cost of these projects, to advance them money so they could continue construction of segments of the hurricane protection system.

As the Corps of Engineers' own Interagency Performance Evaluation Taskforce, or IPET, investigators observed, if one part of the levee system comes up short, it can compromise the entire protection system. Yet this levee system, which was supposed to be protecting one of America's most vulnerable cities, was never finished, and as a result, when Katrina hit last August, dire consequences ensued.

We learned from Katrina that there is a need to focus limited Federal resources on finishing flood control projects that are critical to our Nation's health, safety, and welfare. The Army Corps' current process to do this is inadequate. As the GAO testified before the House in March, “The Corps' planning and project management processes cannot ensure that national priorities are appropriately established across the hundreds of civil works projects that are competing for scarce federal resources.”

The McCain-Feingold amendment on prioritization, which I am proud to co-

sponsor, will address this problem by requiring the Water Resources Planning Coordinating Committee, which the underlying WRDA Bill already establishes for other purposes to evaluate the importance of Corps projects in three different categories—storm damage reduction projects, navigation projects, and environmental restoration projects. The amendment also requires the committee to rank projects in each category so that Congress, and the Corps itself, can determine what projects are the most important to pursue and most worthy of funding. The Coordinating Committee will then submit its report to Congress and make the report available to the public.

With that information, Congress can make better decisions about how to spend scarce Federal resources on critical infrastructure projects across the country. We have to learn from Katrina and we should never again allow a project that is so critical to the very livelihood of so many to languish because we did not give it the priority it deserved.

I know many of my colleagues are concerned that this amendment will remove authority from individual Members about how to spend Army Corps dollars. I understand that concern, but the reality is that the Corps has more work to do than funding to do it. This WRDA bill will add another \$10 to \$12 billion in Army Corps projects on top of the estimated \$58 billion in backlogged Army Corps projects that are authorized but not yet funded. Without some system of prioritizing projects, as this amendment would require, we run the risk of another Katrina-like situation where critical projects are not given the priority they deserve. On the other hand, by requiring the Corps to prioritize projects in each category—flood control, navigation, and environmental restoration—we can ensure that there is a balance among the types of projects that are funded and that the most important and cost-effective projects in each category get the attention they deserve.

Water resources projects are important to each and every State, but we need to heed the lessons of Katrina and make sure that we spend our tax dollars where they are most needed.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

#### GLOBAL WARMING POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to my good friend and colleague, Senator JEFFORDS, for his hard work and leadership in developing comprehensive legislation that will assist in decreasing U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. I am proud to join him, along with my other colleagues Senators BINGAMAN, BOXER, KENNEDY, LEAHY, LAUTENBERG, and REED in introducing the Global Warming Pollution Reduction Act of 2006, GWPRA. This bill sets the United

States on a path to reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 through a 2 percent annual reduction from 2010 through 2020, as well as achieving by 2050 emissions that are 80 percent below 1990 levels.

The global warming debate began in Hawaii over 30 years ago when the Mauna Loa Climate Observatory first documented evidence of increased carbon dioxide levels in the Earth's atmosphere. The international scientific community now concurs that human activities are altering the climate system. The U.S., which is the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases, must be accountable as a leader in reducing emissions and combating the threats resulting from global warming.

My home State of Hawaii is disproportionately susceptible to increases in sea level rise and ocean temperature, which jeopardize public safety, economic development, cultural resources, and the health of our unique island ecosystems and wildlife. It is clear that coastal States will also face similar challenges caused by sea level rise resulting in flooding of low-lying property, loss of coastal wetlands, beach erosion, saltwater contamination of drinking water, and damage to coastal roads and bridges. Climate models forecasting intense storms and severe weather further threaten Hawaii's capacity to respond to natural disasters and acquire immediate relief from neighboring states. Remote and rural areas are likely to be confronted with similar issues of self-sufficiency and limited access to assistance.

I am very concerned about the impact of fossil fuel emissions on the health of our planet and believe that we must actively seek solutions to curb the buildup of greenhouse gases. This bill sets energy efficiency targets to assist both the industry and energy consumers in meeting these standards. This legislation lays out ambitious goals to minimize U.S. emissions and assist in the stabilization of global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations.

We must invest in technology research to control greenhouse gas emissions. Encouraging renewable energy technologies will play a crucial role in successfully meeting the objectives of this legislation. Under the guidance provided by this bill, I firmly believe the State of Hawaii, along with the rest of the United States, will be poised to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. But Federal support is vital to accomplishing our goals to combat global warming.

I appreciate the technical assistance provided by the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute and the Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. I remain committed to working with them, other stakeholders in Hawaii, and my colleagues, under the leadership of Senator JEFFORDS, to enact this legislation that will improve the health of our planet and the quality of life for all Americans. Senator